

REMARKS

Claims 1-68, as amended, remain in the case. The Examiner has withdrawn his final rejection and has cited new prior art in a new, non-final rejection of all claims.

I. Double Patenting Rejection

First, the Examiner has made an obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-65 over claims 14-21 of USP 6,661,784. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection since claims 14-21 of USP 6,661,784 claim a service discovery method in which services are addressed by the service's name. A service name is associated with the address of information about the service in claims 14-21 of USP 6,661,784 and an inquiry requesting information about the service uses the name of the service. In contrast, the Applicants are claiming in the present Application the distributing of a name distribution message associating a user device address with a user-defined name, which is not an obvious variation of claims 14-21 of USP 6,661,784 to services addressed by the service's name. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this ground for rejection.

II. Prior Art Rejection

The Examiner cited the combination of Voit USP 6,215,790 with Barnier et al. USP 6,690,932 in rejecting claims 1-65 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Voit discloses domain name translation of addresses for routing services through a network. Domain names are translated into a group of addresses that can include a mixture of Internet addresses and telephone number addresses, along with routing procedures for those addresses.

Barnier discloses telephone network that includes an automatic location identification database using a caller's number provided by the ANI feature to determine name and address

information.

The combination of Voit and Barnier fails to disclose or suggest the Applicant's claimed distribution of a name distribution message from one member device to the next member device in an ad hoc network. The Applicant's claimed distribution from one member device to the next member device of a name distribution message is patentable over the Voit and Barnier references, taken either singly or in combination.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of all of the claims now in the case and allowance of the application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4004. A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: February 16, 2006

By: 

John E. Hoel
Registration No. 26,279
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101